

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in light of the amendments and remarks herein.

Upon entry of this amendment, claims 1-27 will be pending. By this amendment claims 28 and 29 have been canceled; and claims 1, 12, 21, 22, 25, and 26 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

§ 102 Rejection of Claim 21

In Section 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Matthews, III *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,631,523; hereinafter referred to as “Matthews”).

Claim 21 has been amended to include “user authentication means for receiving authentication information and authenticating the user of the broadcasting contents summary information” to the information manipulation apparatus.

Matthews, however, fails to teach or suggest an information manipulation apparatus for creating for a user summary playback information showing the summary contents of broadcasting contents information, where the information manipulation apparatus includes user authentication means for receiving authentication information and authenticating the user of the broadcasting contents summary information.

Accordingly, it is submitted that the Examiner’s rejection of claim 21 based upon 35 U.S.C. §102(e) has been overcome by the present remarks and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

§ 103 Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 3, 25, and 28

In Section 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, 3, 25, and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Matthews in view of Dunn (U.S. Patent No. 5,945,987).

Claims 1 and 25 have been amended to include “user authentication means for receiving authentication information and authenticating the user of the broadcasting contents summary information” to the information supply apparatus. Claim 28 has been canceled.

Matthews and Dunn, individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest an information supply apparatus for providing to a user broadcasting contents summary information obtained by summarizing the broadcasting contents information, where the information supply apparatus includes user authentication means for receiving authentication information and authenticating the user of the broadcasting contents summary information. Therefore, claims 1 and 25 should be allowable over the combination of Matthews and Dunn. Since claims 2 and 3 depend from claim 1, claims 2 and 3 should also be allowable over the combination of Matthews and Dunn.

Accordingly, it is submitted that the Examiner’s rejection of claims 1, 2, 3, 25, and 28 based upon 35 U.S.C. §103(a) has been overcome by the present remarks and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

§ 103 Rejection of Claim 4

In Section 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Matthews in view of Dunn, and further in view of Anderson *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,005,631; hereinafter referred to as “Anderson”).

In view of the above discussion regarding claim 1, and since claim 4 depends from claim 1, claim 4 should be allowable over the combination of Matthews and Dunn. Further, since Anderson is indicated as disclosing a method and apparatus for organizing and searching an EPG, claim 4 should be allowable over the combination of Matthews, Dunn, and Anderson.

Accordingly, it is submitted that the Examiner's rejection of claim 4 based upon 35 U.S.C. §103(a) has been overcome by the present remarks and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

§ 103 Rejection of Claims 5, 6, and 7

In Section 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 5, 6, and 7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Matthews in view of Dunn, and further in view of Abecassis (U.S. Patent No. 6,553,178).

In view of the above discussion regarding claim 1, and since claims 5, 6, and 7 depend from claim 1, claims 5, 6, and 7 should be allowable over the combination of Matthews and Dunn. Further, since Abecassis is indicated as disclosing a VOD system, claims 5, 6, and 7 should be allowable over the combination of Matthews, Dunn, and Abecassis.

Accordingly, it is submitted that the Examiner's rejection of claims 5, 6, and 7 based upon 35 U.S.C. §103(a) has been overcome by the present remarks and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

§ 103 Rejection of Claims 8 and 9

In Section 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Matthews in view of Dunn, and further in view of

Kamada *et al.* (U.S. Patent Application No. 20030056208; hereinafter referred to as “Kamada”).

In view of the above discussion regarding claim 1, and since claims 8 and 9 depend from claim 1, claims 8 and 9 should be allowable over the combination of Matthews and Dunn.

Further, since Kamada is indicated as disclosing a method and device for obtaining audience data on a TV program, claims 8 and 9 should be allowable over the combination of Matthews, Dunn, and Kamada.

Accordingly, it is submitted that the Examiner’s rejection of claims 8 and 9 based upon 35 U.S.C. §103(a) has been overcome by the present remarks and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

§ 103 Rejection of Claims 10 and 11

In Section 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 10 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Matthews in view of Dunn, and further in view of Kamada, and further in view of Goldman *et al.* (U.S. Patent Application No. 20030135853; hereinafter referred to as “Goldman”).

In view of the above discussion regarding claim 8, and since claims 10 and 11 depend from claim 8, claims 10 and 11 should be allowable over the combination of Matthews, Dunn and Kamada. Further, since Goldman is indicated as disclosing a system and method for inserting advertisements, claims 10 and 11 should be allowable over the combination of Matthews, Dunn, Kamada, and Goldman.

Accordingly, it is submitted that the Examiner’s rejection of claims 10 and 11 based upon 35 U.S.C. §103(a) has been overcome by the present remarks and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

§ 103 Rejection of Claims 12-15, 17-20, 22-24, 26, 27, and 29

In Section 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 12-15, 17-20, 22-24, 26, 27, and 29 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Matthews in view of Dunn and Barth (U.S. Patent Application No. 20030135864).

Claims 12 and 26 have been amended to include user authentication means for “receiving authentication information and authenticating the user of the broadcasting contents summary information” to the information utilization apparatus and method. Claim 22 has been amended to include the same limitation to the information supply system. Claim 29 has been canceled.

Matthews, Dunn, and Barth, individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest an information utilization apparatus/method or information supply system including user authentication means for receiving authentication information and authenticating the user of the broadcasting contents summary information. Therefore, claims 12, 22, and 26 should be allowable over the combination of Matthews, Dunn, and Barth. Since claims 13-15 and 17-20 depend from claim 12, claims 13-15 and 17-20 should also be allowable over the combination of Matthews, Dunn, and Barth. Further, since claims 23-24 and 27 depend from claims 22 and 26, respectively, claims 23-24 and 27 should also be allowable over the combination of Matthews, Dunn, and Barth.

Accordingly, it is submitted that the Examiner’s rejection of claims 12-15, 17-20, 22-24, 26, 27, and 29 based upon 35 U.S.C. §103(a) has been overcome by the present remarks and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

§ 103 Rejection of Claim 16

In Section 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claim 16 under 35 U.S.C.

§103(a) as being unpatentable over Matthews in view of Dunn and Barth, and further in view of Blackwell *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,449,654; hereinafter referred to as “Blackwell”).

In view of the above discussion regarding claim 12, and since claim 16 depends from claim 12, claim 16 should be allowable over the combination of Matthews, Dunn and Barth. Further, since Blackwell is indicated as disclosing a system and method for retransmitting data within a cable television network, claim 16 should be allowable over the combination of Matthews, Dunn, Barth, and Blackwell.

Accordingly, it is submitted that the Examiner’s rejection of claim 16 based upon 35 U.S.C. §103(a) has been overcome by the present remarks and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, entry of this amendment, and the allowance of this application with claims 1-27 are respectfully solicited.

In regard to the claims amended herein and throughout the prosecution of this application, it is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, are patentably distinct over the prior art of record, and that these claims were in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112. Changes that have been made to these claims were not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §§101, 102, 103 or 112. Rather, these changes were made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicant is entitled.

In the event that additional cooperation in this case may be helpful to complete its prosecution, the Examiner is cordially invited to contact Applicant's representative at the telephone number written below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any insufficient fees or credit any overpayment associated with the above-identified application to Deposit Account 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP

By:



Samuel S. Lee, Reg. No. 42,791 for

William S. Frommer

Reg. No. 25,506

(212) 588-0800